DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 790 EA 026 541

AUTHOR Lampe, Scherie E.; Cramer, Susan R.
TITLE In Response to the Call for Change: The University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Educational Leadership Program Model.
PUB DATE Mar 94
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (49th, Chicago, IL, March 19-22, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Administration; Educational Philosophy; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Leadership Training; Models
IDENTIFIERS *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

ABSTRACT

This paper describes revisions made by faculty in the educational leadership program at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh. The program focuses on empowerment, reflective practices, integration of theory and practice, leadership development, the identification of desired outcomes, and the inclusion of Total Quality Management principles. The program integrated the following core curriculum components: self-knowledge development, an expanded professional knowledge base, experiential learning activities combining theory and practice, and continuous improvement. The integration of the core curriculum components was guided by three models: the technical-scientific deductive design characterized by the works of both Tyler and Hunkins; the technical-scientific design characterized by the work of Taba; and the naturalistic design outlined by Glatthorn. The faculty developed a nine-step curriculum development/infusion model based on the most desirable aspects of each model: (1) assess alternatives, evaluate current approach, and diagnose needs; (2) develop program goals and philosophy; (3) conduct curriculum conceptualization and legitimization; (4) select content and concepts, stake out territory, and plan for evaluation; (5) develop course (instructor); (6) implement; (7) communicate expectations to students; (8) evaluate; and (9) maintain. Five figures are included. The appendix lists the program's critical core competencies. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 790

In Response to the Call for Change: The University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Educational Leadership Program Model

Scherie E. Lampe, Ph.D.
and
Susan R. Cramer, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Lampe

S. Cramer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA026541

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In Response to The Call for Change: The University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Educational Leadership Program Model

American education has been at the forefront of public policy analysis since the early 1970's when prestigious groups began the clamorous call for reform. A spate of critical documents in the 1980's followed with more than 200 state commissions and task forces reporting negative and alarming data about the status of the public schools. In response to these reports, numerous research studies were conducted which supported the damning evidence of the commissions. National education professional groups also analyzed schooling and proclaimed it to be wanting in a number of significant areas including: student performance, parent approval, and teacher and administrator morale and satisfaction. As all of these groups chronicled the demise of public education, the media jumped on the bandwagon and sounded the bell of alarm.

Efforts to redirect or halt this perilous trend effecting public schooling were characterized by distinct phases. The first wave of restructuring efforts to increase the quality and effectiveness of the educational enterprise was comprised of public policy mandates and inducements. These initiatives did little to change either the functioning or public perception of the status of American schools. Out of the cacophony of this restructuring attempt emerged the second wave which has emphasized capacity-building and system-changing initiatives that aim for fundamental transformation of schools through democratic approaches to teaching and learning, management and leadership, and determination of outcome performance goals (Sergiovanni,

Burlingame, Coombs, & Thurston, 1992).

Within Wisconsin the research-supported call for increased democratic management of American schools was heard. In response the Wisconsin Legislature passed the Management Restructuring Program, Wis. Stats. 118.013, in 1992. The Act was designed to decentralize school board powers and duties and to promote shared decision making in local school districts. This legislation provided a major impetus for the faculty in the Educational Leadership program at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh to examine program curricula.

Curricular Change in Higher Education

In order to accomplish the task of preparing educational leaders for participatory management, higher education and schools must shift paradigms and reconceptualize the future needs of schools and educators in a high-technology Information Age which calls for increased empowerment of teachers and support personnel. Zukav (1979) depicted the need well in his book The Dancing, when he stated that restructuring must cause us to "slip the bonds of the known to venture far into the unexplored territory which lies beyond the barrier of the obvious" (p. 82).

Changing paradigms is difficult for individuals, more so for institutions. In general, the literature suggests that higher education institutions have not responded to the pressures to substantially alter their offerings or the method of instruction in Educational Leadership programs. Murphy (1991) conducted a study examining the effect of the reform movement on leader preparation programs, and determined that

only slight to moderate changes were being made in compliance with reform admonitions and recommendations. He attributed this to lack of motivation of college preparation programs to embrace change. The single area where more change efforts converge is in the augmentation of curricular efforts to address leadership issues which are consonant with reform exhortations. Although there is evidence that slight changes in curriculum are being made on a limited basis, experts note the dearth of transformative training programs (Schon, 1983\; Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, & Thurston, 1992) and have advocated for a curricular focus aimed at developing reflective practice and increased integration of theory and practice (Norris & Lebsack, 1992). McCarthy (1988) and her colleagues discuss course content in leadership preparation programs with great concern and indicate that "Systemic curriculum revision demands a level of commitment and effort from faculty members that they do not presently seem prepared to give" (Murphy, 1991, p. 17).

If true curricular renewal and transformation in higher education is to occur, it must be at the programmatic level (Johnston, 1992). Understanding this need, the educational leadership program faculty at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh have focused on revision at the program level.

Components of Educational Programs

Various commissions, associations, and researchers have identified competencies required of educators. The National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers both recommend that leadership program curricula include shared governance attributes and methods of implementation, and human

relations based leadership models (Johnston, 1992). Drucker (1986) asserts that future educational leaders will be required to frame problems and design novel solutions to problems in a cooperative work team environment. Norris and Lebsack (1992) in reporting findings from a three year pilot project designed to examine different approaches to the preparation of school leaders, identify six necessary components: a) programs must have personal meaning and relevancy, b) cohort and mentor experiences are important in assisting the scholars' bonding, c) sufficient time and structure are needed to increase scholar interaction, d) level of student professional maturity effect the ability and level of self direction, e) curriculum requirements and teaching must reflect the professors' commitment to the theory/practice structure, and f) field experiences need to reflect and support college preparation for reflective practice.

Johnston (1992) writes that the new mission of schools will require significant changes in preparation of administrators and teachers in order to fulfill the position requirements as they employ different policy tools and approaches than those traditionally used in our bureaucratic schools which were designed to meet the needs of the Industrial Age. "The need is no longer simply to induce conformity to established practice among future teachers and administrators but rather to develop a critical analytic approach to the production of new practices" (Johnston, 1992, p. 100).

Lastly, Feigenbaum (1993) provides a critical analysis of the need for major changes in the infrastructure of American education in order to remain competitive in the world market. He asserts that there is an intense need to dramatically change the

manner in which we provide education in Quality principles. Severe limitations in method of training have resulted in a loose collection of courses and a failure to address Quality as a fundamental body of knowledge. This comprehensive process needs to flow from the K-12 system to the university and beyond. Staff development and graduate education must address the issue of service delivery of Quality principles in an integrated manner. Resultant from the heavy emphasis on accountability of the first wave, during the 1970's and 1980's many of the Quality principles recommended today, e.g. solving problems democratically, the value of teamwork, empowerment and self efficacy, were overlooked or purged from utilization by a concentration on accountability and standardization of performance. They need to be reinstituted.

Curriculum Development

The change from traditional leadership course work to one reflecting the previously mentioned concepts is not merely curricular nor structural but endemic in nature. This involves fundamental differences in the way one thinks, acts, and envisions the future. The University of Wisconsin Oshkosh program in Educational Leadership addresses this inherent difference in philosophy because of its focus on empowerment, reflective practices, integration of theory and practice, leadership development focus, identification of desired outcomes, and inclusion of Quality principles. A major strength of this program is its long tradition and firm foundation in principles of empowerment and self-efficacy. To further enhance this belief system, critical core concepts designed to promote democratic leadership features, with a grounding in Quality, have been embedded throughout the infrastructure of the

Educational Leadership program. These concepts have been identified as: a) self-knowledge development, b) an expanded professional knowledge base, c) experiential learning activities combining theory and practice, and d) a central focus on continuous improvement (See Appendix A).

Integration of the critical core components required thorough examination of curriculum development models and assumptions. While there are many curriculum development models developed by various authors, three major models predominate: the technical-scientific deductive design characterized by the works of both Tyler and Hunkins, the technical-scientific inductive design characterized by the work of Taba, and the naturalistic design as outlined by Glatthorn. Each development model operates under a set of assumptions.

Technical-scientific curriculum models (Figures 1 and 2) attempt to apply scientific methods and principles to the task of curriculum development. Curriculum writers work with the assumptions that reality is definable, that the goals of education are knowable, and that a linear, objective process of curriculum development will yield a useful document which will result in high quality instructional plans for the classroom.

Within the technical-scientific model (Figure 3) one may follow a deductive or inductive process. The deductive approach is top-down whereby curriculum developers, typically administrators, consider the broader questions of purposes of education and societal needs before they address what will occur at the classroom level. The inductive process conversely leaves curriculum development to teachers and begins by developing individual units which will then be assembled into a

cohesive program.

The naturalistic model (Figure 4) follows a nontechnical-nonrational approach to curriculum development. Advocates of this general approach believe that curriculum evolves as learners, teachers, and knowledge interact. Likewise, all goals of education cannot be predefined, content can only be tentatively selected, and learning will be based on the creation of knowledge, especially self-knowledge. Curriculum development under this model is also perceived of as highly political. As such, administrators and teachers need to work together in developing and building support for the curriculum.

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Educational Leadership Program Curriculum Development/Infusion Model

Faculty in the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Educational Leadership program subscribe to the assumptions of the three curriculum development models to various degrees, which strongly influenced the curriculum development/infusion process. From the deductive technical-scientific model emerged the need by some faculty to discuss program goals and philosophy. Other faculty subscribed more to the nontechnical-nonrational approach which assumes that all goals of education cannot be predefined so were less interested in developing a formal program goal and philosophy statement.

Participation in the program development/infusion process included all program faculty who hold either faculty or faculty and administrative appointments. Therefore,

from the participation aspect, both administrators and instructors worked together vis-a-vis Glickman's Naturalistic model which is considered nontechnical-nonrational.

Also following within the nontechnical-nonrational vein were decisions related to content selection and viewing curriculum development as a political undertaking. Content selection was not intended to be comprehensive in scope. Rather, critical concepts and associated courses were identified leaving individual course instructors the freedom to add additional content they deemed important. Furthermore, it was agreed upon and built into the program design that certain content/concepts would be addressed in more than one course with the overlap being both planned and desired. Within the political realm, all faculty recognized the political nature of the development/infusion process. Academic freedom and "turf" issues within the larger college were always being considered.

The curriculum development/infusion model which resulted follows (Figure 5). As can be seen, pieces of the Tyler, Hunkins, Taba, and Glatthorn models appear. This eclectic approach attempts to integrate the best aspects of each model thereby creating a new model. Step one (a. assess the alternatives, b. evaluate current approach, c. diagnose needs) involved critically examining the program and available evidence of student learning. Specifically, program faculty examined comprehensive examination papers completed by students after completion of the core, the first 15 credits in the program, and seminar papers and presentations completed as a culminating experience within the program. These two pieces of evidence indicated that some students had missed valuable concepts and skills as they proceeded through

the program. Furthermore, evidence of newer educational thrusts such as the Quality movement were nonexistent. Therefore, student deficiencies were noted.

Program and individual course direction were provided in steps two and three. Step two, development of a goal and philosophy statement, occurred after examination of previously drafted documents and discussion among faculty as to the purpose of the program for today's educators. Both a goal statement and philosophy statement were written. These statements were then shared with program students and area educators. Step three, curriculum conceptualization and legitimization, involved additional discussion as to potential course and content sequences, student needs, and a review of research findings/directives related to educational leadership programs.

Content/concept selection, staking out territory, and planning for evaluation are all combined in step four. Since we were working with an already existing program and with faculty who had already taught each course, content/concept selection and staking out territory could not be separated. Each faculty person had a vested interest in certain concepts, theories, and content. Likewise, the faculty recognized that we had to be able to document learning in order to ascertain program quality, therefore, an evaluation schema had to be developed in conjunction with content/concept selection. To address this step, it is not fully completed at this point in time, program faculty brainstormed, reviewed course syllabi, and scoured research to compile a list of vital content/concepts to be included in the program. Individual courses were then juxtaposed with previously identified content/concepts resulting in the development of a matrix. Content/concepts were then targeted for emphasis in various courses.

Lastly, it was agreed that the program evaluation would be comprised of three experiences: a comprehensive examination taken at the conclusion of 15 core credits, a seminar paper and presentation or thesis and defense completed as a culminating experience in the degree program, and a portfolio compiled by each student which would be formally presented twice. The first presentation would be at the time of the comprehensive examination, the second would be at the seminar/thesis presentation.

Steps six, seven, eight, and nine as well as refining step four are currently underway. Course development/revision by individual instructors, step six, is occurring as content/concepts are targeted for each course. Likewise, a new policy of orienting ad hoc faculty and non-program faculty to course expectations is being implemented. Implementation, step seven, is occurring as each updated course is taught. Step eight, communication of expectations to students, is also underway as students are informed of the new portfolio requirement in classes, individual advising sessions, and large group advising/information sessions. Lastly, steps eight and nine, evaluation and maintenance will be ongoing processes as the program is monitored to assure continuous improvement.

Conclusion

Responding to the call for change in an educational leadership program is a challenge. Concepts such as shared governance, empowerment, leadership, Quality, and reflective practice are not easily planned for and taught. The University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Model is presented with the hope of providing direction to others as it chronicles how one program faculty navigated the process. Evidence of success

is already emerging.

References

References

Drucker, P. (1986). The frontiers of management. New York: Harper and Row.

Feigenbaum, A.V. (1993). We can't improve American quality if we aren't teaching it National Productivity Review, 139-141.

Glatthorn, A.A. (1987). Curriculum renewal. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hass, G. and Parkay, F.W. (1993). Curriculum planning: A new approach (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnston, B.J. (1992). Perspectives of AFT and NEA on shared governance and administrator preparation programs. Journal of School Leadership, 2, 90-103.

McCarthy, M.M., Kuh, G., Newell, L. and Iacoona, C. (1988). Under scrutiny: The educational administration professorate. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (1991). The effects of the educational reform movement on departments of educational leadership. Cambridge, MA: The National Center for Education Leadership.

Norris, C.J. and Lebsack, J. (1992). A pathway to restructuring: Discussion of a university pilot for principalship preparation. Journal of School Leadership, 2, 45-59.

Oliva, P.F. (1992). Developing the curriculum. New York: HarperCollins.

Ornstein, A. C. and Hunkins, F. (1993). Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Sergiovanni, T.J. Burlingame, M., Coombs, F. and Thurston, P.W. (1992). Educational governance and administration. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wiles, J. and Bondi, J. (1989). Curriculum development: A guide to practice. (3rd ed.) Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing.

Zukav, L. (1979). The dancing. New York: Bantam Books.

Figure 1: Tyler Model

1. Define purposed of the school\; identify instructional objectives.
2. Relate educational experiences to school purposes.
3. Organize educational experiences.
4. Evaluate purposes for program effectiveness.

(Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993, p. 267-8\; Wiles & Bondi, 1989, p. 10)

Figure 2: Hunkins Model

1. Curriculum conceptualization & legitimization

   what is the nature of curriculum

   key components

   potential designs or sequences

   student needs

2. Diagnosis

   translate needs into causes

   generate goals and objectives, expected learner outcomes

3. Content selection

4. Experience and material selection by teacher

5. Implementation

   pilot

   final diffusion

6. Evaluation -

   furnish data so decisions can be made to continue, modify, or discontinue program

7. Maintenance

   method and means for program management to assure continued effective

   functioning of program

** Feedback and adjustment loop allowing decision makers to refer back to previous stages throughout model to make needed modifications.

(Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993, 270-3; Hass & Parkay, 1993, p. 329-32)

Figure 3: Taba Model

1. Produce pilot units
2. Test experimental units
3. Revise and consolidate units
4. Develop a framework
5. Install and disseminate new units

Taba Pilot Unit Development Model

1. Diagnosis needs - what are current gaps in student learning
2. Formulate objectives
3. Select content
4. Organize content
5. Select learning experiences
6. Organize learning activities
7. Determine what to evaluate and ways and means of evaluation
8. Check for balance and sequence

(Oliva, 1992, p. 160-2)

Figure 4: Glatthorn: Naturalistic Model

1. Assess the alternatives -evaluate current approaches
2. Stake out the territory

    define course parameters

    define learning audience

    define learning activities
3. Develop a constituency
4. Build the knowledge base

    identify content

    gather data on faculty skill and support

    gather data on student audience
5. Block the unit

    select unit topics

    write general objectives
6. Develop unit planning guide
7. Plan quality learning experiences

    select experiences not content to be learned
8. Develop course examination

    tell how learning will be documented (not test development)
9. Develop learning scenarios
10. Package the product

(Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993, p. 274\; Glatthorn 1987, p. 89+)

Figure 5: University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Model

1. a. Assess the alternatives
   b. Evaluate current approach
   c. Diagnose needs
2. Develop program goals and philosophy
3. Conduct curriculum conceptualization and legitimization
4. a. Content/concept selection
   b. Stake out territory
   c. Plan for evaluation
5. Course development by instructor
6. Implement
7. Communicate expectations to students
8. Evaluate
9. Maintain

Appendix A

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Educational Leadership Program
Critical Core Competencies

Self Knowledge Development
Educational Philosophy
Leadership Style
Locus of Control
Reflective Practices
Self Awareness
Self Efficacy
Supervisory Beliefs

Professional Knowledge Base
Historical Perspectives of Education
Theoretical Underpinnings of...
- Curriculum
- Supervision
- Organizations
- Cultural Diversity
- Educational Research
- Content Area(s)

Research Findings
- Clinical Supervision
- Cooperative Learning
- Effective Schools
- Mastery Learning
- Staff Development
- Site Based Management
- others

Current Trends
Future Directions

Continuous Improvement/Quality
History
Models
Principles
Terminology
Tools

Experiential Learning Activities
Action Research
Case Studies
Clinical Observations
Coaching
Cooperative Learning
Debates
Discussions
Field Projects
Goal Setting
Guest Speakers
Interviews
Job Shadowing
Journaling
Mastery Learning
Modeling
Personal Inventories
Portfolios
Practicums
Presentations
Projects - Oral
- Written
- Other format

Reading - Texts
- Professional Literature
- Popular Literature

Research/Thesis
Reflecting
Role Playing
Simulations - Individual
- Group

Videos & other technology
other